1 The Honorable David G. Estudillo 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 9 WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON 10 AT TACOMA 11 Case No.: 3:23-cv-06046-DGE NATHAN BRINTON, 12 Plaintiff, ORDER GRANTING JOINT 13 STIPULATED MOTION TO VACATE AND STAY (1) THE NOTING DATE 14 ONE TECHNOLOGIES, LLC, **ON DEFENDANT ONE** JOHN DOES 1-10 TECHNOLOGIES, LLC'S PENDING 15 **MOTION TO DISMISS; AND (2)** ONE TECHNOLOGIES, LLC'S 16 Defendants. **DEADLINE TO FILE A REPLY TO** PLAINTIFF'S BRIEF IN OPPOSITION 17 AND RESPONSE TO THE PENDING 18 **MOTION (DKT. NOS. 23-24)** 19 NOTE ON MOTION CALENDAR: February 20, 2024 20 21 22 23 24 25 ORDER Page 1 of 3 STERNBERG THOMSON OKRENT & SCHER, PLLC

On February 20, 2024, plaintiff Nathan Brinton and defendant One Technologies, LLC submitted to the Court a joint stipulated motion to vacate and stay (1) the noting date on One Technologies' pending motion to dismiss, and (2) One Technologies' deadline to file a reply to plaintiff's brief in opposition and response to One Technologies' motion (Dkt. Nos. 23-24)¹, pending the Court's decision on the parties' forthcoming joint stipulated motion to transfer this civil action to the United States District Court for the Northern District of Texas, Dallas Division.

After full consideration of the joint stipulated motion, the Court hereby **GRANTS** the parties' motion and hereby **STAYS** both the noting date on the pending motion to dismiss and defendant One Technologies LLC's deadline to file a reply to plaintiff's brief in opposition and response to its motion to dismiss pending further order of the Court.

The Court further **ORDERS** that if the parties cannot agree to the joint motion to transfer or if the motion is denied, the parties shall, by no later than five (5) court days after reaching an impasse or the Court's order denying the joint motion, stipulate and propose to the Court a new reply date and noting date for One Technologies LLC's motion to dismiss.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: February 29, 2024

David G. Estudillo
United States District Judge

ORDER Page 2 of 3

¹ Plaintiff filed two oppositions to One Technologies' motion to dismiss at Dkt. 23 and 24, respectively. It appears that Dkt. 24 is a corrected version of Dkt. 23.

1	
2	Presented by
3	/s/ Craig S. Sternberg Craig S. Sternberg (WSBA No. 521)
4	520 Kirkland Way, Suite 400
5	P.O. Box 655 Kirkland, Washington 98083
6	(206) 386-5438 Craig@STOSLaw.com
7	Ari N. Rothman (pro hac vice)
8	VENABLE LLP
9	600 Massachusetts Avenue, NW Washington, DC 20001
10	(202) 344-4000 anrothman@venable.com
11	Attorneys for Defendant One Technologies, LLC
12	
13	/s/ Andrew Grimm Andrew Grimm (WSBA No. 51486)
14	DIGITAL JUSTICE FOUNDATION 15287 Pepperwood Drive
15	Omaha, Nebraska 68154 (531) 210-2381
16	Andrew@DigitalJusticeFoundation.org
17	Attorneys for Plaintiff Nathan Brinton
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	

ORDER Page 3 of 3